

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 KAHEAL PARRISH,

Case No. 1:11-cv-00460-JLT (PC)

12 Plaintiff,

ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 vs.

14 A. SOLIS, et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16 \_\_\_\_\_/

17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se. On March 18, 2011, Plaintiff filed a complaint and  
18 initiated this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

19 The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity  
20 jurisdiction, be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants  
21 reside in the same state, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions  
22 giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is  
23 situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in which  
24 the action may otherwise be brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

25 In this case, none of the defendants reside in this district. Moreover, the events alleged in the  
26 complaint occurred in Monterey County, which is within the jurisdiction of the Northern District of  
27 California. This action should therefore have been filed in the United States District Court for the  
28 Northern District of California.

1 In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to  
2 the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).  
3 Accordingly, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that this matter is transferred to the United States District  
4 Court for the Northern District of California.

5  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: March 22, 2011

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE